copy

UCLA DAILY BRUIN - Oct. 31, 1966

LIEBELER RESEARCHES WARREN COMMISSION

An extensive research project into the findings of the Warren Commission on the assassination President John F. Kennedy is presently being conducted by UCLA law Prof. Wesley J. Liebeler, who served as an assistant council for the Commission.

This project, which Liebeler is basically handling through a seminar group of 20 law students, has already been brought to the public's attention through television and news clippings.

The wealth of criticism directed towards the Commission's conclusions, especially Mark Lane's book, "Rush to Judgment," and Edward Jay Epstein's, "Inquest," Liebeler says, is directly responsible for his conducting this investigation. He wants to evaluate thoroughly and objectively the information in the 26 volumes of the Warren Report, something he thinks the critics haven't done. With the conclusion of the investigation he is conducting Liebeler plans to "publish a book setting forth both sides objectively."

CRITICAL OF LANE

His main criticism is towards attorney Lane. After studying Lane's book and his public statements, Liebeler has concluded that they are a "tissue of distortion."

Liebeler gave the picture Lane showed at a UCLA meeting between the two of them as an example of building a false case. The print was taken from a 35 mm slide taken with 12 others by an amateur photographer at the time of the assassination. When developed the Commission's print did not include the head of a man that was visible in Lane's print on a far edge of the picture. Lane says the man is Jack Ruby. Liebeler said that although it is not readily visible, and takes a certain amount of wit to understand, what really happened is that t he print was made with the cardboard encasing the slide not being removed, so that the outer edges of this picture, and of the other 11, were cut off.

This Liebeler concluded, is the normal procedure for developing 35 mm slides unless otherwise requested and was not an attempt of the Commission's part to disregard evidence.

The seminar itself basically is going to go through the 26 volumes of the Report and analyze them on the basis of the following topics:

1- How did the police get the description that was sent out over the police radio and what is the likelihood that it led to Lee Harvey Oswald's arrest? General treatment by the Warren Report of eye-witness identification of Oswald.

2- Evidence on Oswald's rifle capacity.

3- Source of the shots.

4- Did Oswald purchase the rifle and keep it in his possession until the time of the assassination?

5- Did Oswald bring the rifle into the Texas School Book Depository on Nov.22, 1963, or at any other time?

6- Was Oswald at the window at the time of the assassination?

7- Did Oswald kill officer J.D. Tippit?

8- What did Oswald do from 12:30 p.m. to the time he was ar-

rested in the Texas Theater?

9- Did Oswald earlier shoot at retired Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker?

10- Analysis of the story that Oswald had a sight mounted on a rifle at a gun shop in suburban Irving, indicating he owned another rifle.

11- Analysis of the testimony by Sylvia Odio suggesting that Oswald may have been involved with Cubans in a conspiracy.

12- Were Oswald and his killer, Jack Ruby known to each other before the assassination or involved in any kind of conspiracy directly or indirectly?

13- Make the strongest argument that a) Oswald was not involved in the assassination at all and b) that he did not do it alone. Defend the report on these propositions.

14- Where was the bullet found that was recovered after the assassination?

15- Medical evidence relevant to the one-bullet theory.

16- Other physical facts on the bullet - trajectory, firearms identification, weight, etc.

17- Did the bullet go through the president's body as suggested by the one-bullet theory, and if not, when was the president hit, what hit him and where is it?